

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-33 were pending in this application. No claims are amended in this response.

The Examiner objected to the specification because of an informality on page 20. The specification has been amended to correct the informality.

Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Maeng (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,652). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 1 includes the feature of "a single handler coupled to the first and second testers." The Examiner refers to element 40 in Maeng's Figure 4 as a "handler". However, Maeng refers to element 40 as "a transferring member 40 such as a cart, a transfer rail, a conveyer belt, or an automated guide vehicle . . . ." (col. 9, lines 47-49) None of these examples listed by Maeng resemble a handler as described in the instant specification. See page 11, first paragraph, for example, which states that "handler 304 preferably comprises an enclosed space that IC's are disposed within while tests are performed by the first and second tests 336/308." Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 and Claims 2-17 depending therefrom are patentable over Maeng.

With regard to Claims 2 and 3, Applicant finds no reference in Maeng to a first tester being adapted to calibrate a second tester or a second tester being adapted to submit a request for calibration to the first tester, which was asserted by the Examiner as appearing in Maeng's Figure 5. Similarly, with regard to Claim 4, there appears to be no disclosure in Maeng of an apparatus for testing at least one first IC and at least one second IC wherein the first tester is adapted to calibrate the second tester at predetermined time intervals or when ambient temperature has changed by a predetermined amount as asserted by the

Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out with particularity where in Maeng such disclosures appear since they do not appear in Figure 5.

With regard to Claim 7, the Examiner asserts that Maeng's host computer 45 performs as a multiplexer. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Maeng's reference to host computer 45 at col. 10, lines 11-14 gives no hint of that element performing as a multiplexer. For example, Maeng states as follows: "[t]he test results and other information obtained from each test step are sent to a host computer 45 through a network, and then transmitted to the sorting unit 51 in the form of test tray maps . . .," whereas, in contrast, a multiplexer connects testers performing first and second test procedures to first and second ICs. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 7 is patentable over Maeng.

For Claims 8-10, the Examiner relies only on Maeng's Figure 5 for support. Applicant respectfully submits that Maeng's Figure 5 says nothing about whether the ICs are in wafer form or not, or whether the testers are high or low cost.

With regard to Claim 12, the Examiner refers to Maeng's element 50 as a storage means. Applicant disagrees. Maeng's statement regarding element 50 (col. 9, lines 44-46) is that "[t]he sorting unit 51, the marking unit 52, and the visual inspection unit 53 are preferably provided in one machine." Maeng says nothing about storage in this passage.

With regard to Claim 14, Applicant submits that Maeng fails to teach ICs that store identification information. With regard to Claim 17, Maeng does not disclose one tester being integral to the other. Maeng's testers in Figure 5 are shown in series as separate and distinct units.

Claim 18 includes the feature of "a single handler coupled to the first and second testers." As argued above with respect to Claim 1, Maeng does not disclose such a feature. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 18 is patentable over Maeng.

Claim 19 includes the feature of "a single handler coupled to the first and second testers, wherein the first and second test procedures are adapted to

test at least some different IC parameters, and wherein the first tester is integral to the handler." Maeng does not disclose a handler, and therefore does not disclose a first or second tester integral to a handler. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 19 and 20 are patentable over Maeng.

Claim 21 is to a method of testing in an apparatus comprising a first tester and a second tester coupled to a single handler. As argued above, Maeng does not disclose such a handler. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 21 and Claims 22-33 depending therefrom are patentable over Maeng.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of Claims 1-33. If the Examiner has any questions or other correspondence regarding this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed telephone number and address.

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
Phone: 972 917-5653  
Fax: 972 917-4418

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. Skrehot  
Reg. No. 36,682